

DLD-221

June 5, 2008

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

C.A. No. **08-2159**

STEVEN L. ROMANSKY

VS.

CONNER BLAINE, JR., ET AL.

(M.D. PA CIV. NO. 00-CV-01520)

Present: BARRY, CHAGARES and ROTH, Circuit Judges

Submitted are

- (1) Appellant's request for a certificate of appealability under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1); and
- (2) Appellant's "Notice to the Court"

in the above-captioned case.

Respectfully,

Clerk

MMW/TRA/zm/par

ORDER

The foregoing application for a certificate of appealability is denied because Steven Romansky has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253. Reasonable jurists would not debate whether the District Court was correct in denying Romansky's claims. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 338 (2003) (citing Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)). Romansky's claim of state law error is not cognizable, see 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); Estelle v. McGuire, 502 U.S. 62, 68 (1991), and his claims of violations of his right to counsel and right to due process are without merit, see Michigan v. Jackson, 475 U.S. 625, 629 (1986); Texas v. Cobb, 532 U.S. 162, 167-68 (2001); Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419, 435 (1995). To the extent that Romansky requested that counsel be appointed, his request is denied.



Marcia M. Waldron
Marcia M. Waldron, Clerk

By the Court,

/s/ Michael A. Chagares
Circuit Judge

Dated: July 9, 2008
par/cc: Mr. S.L.R.
A.F.McK., Esq.